

R E M A R K S

Careful review and examination of the subject application are noted and appreciated.

IN THE SPECIFICATION

The specification has been amended for consistency. No new matter has been introduced.

SUPPORT FOR CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Support for the amendments to the claims can be found in the drawings as originally filed, for example, FIGS. 7, 8, 9a, 9b, 11 and 27 and in the specification as originally filed, for example, on page 8, lines 2-23, on page 9, line 9 through page 10, line 24, on page 14, lines 1-10, and on page 30, lines 3-15. As such, no new matter has been introduced.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-8 and 11-19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Malinowski et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,574,572, hereinafter Malinowski) has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn.

Malinowski is directed to a video scaling method and device (Title).

In contrast to Malinowski, the present invention (claim 1) provides an address generator circuit configured to generate one or more first control signals and comprising a finite state machine configured to allow multiple luma and chroma picture requests to follow in sequence. Claims 15 and 16 include similar limitations. Malinowski is silent regarding a finite state machine. Since Malinowski is silent regarding a finite state machine, it follows that Malinowski does not disclose or suggest an address generator circuit comprising a finite state machine configured to allow multiple luma and chroma picture requests to follow in sequence, as presently claimed. Therefore, Malinowski does not disclose or suggest each and every element of the presently claimed invention, arranged as in the claims. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over the cited reference and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-14 and 17-20 depend, either directly or indirectly, from either claim 1 or claim 16 which are believed to be allowable. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over the cited reference and the rejection should be withdrawn.

New claims 21-23 depend from claim 1 which is believed to be allowable. As such, claims 21-23 are fully patentable over the cited reference.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Malinowski in view of Chen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,356,315, hereinafter Chen) has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Malinowski in view of Chen in further view of Fandrianto et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,982,459, hereinafter Fandrianto) has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 5 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Malinowski in view of Iwase (U.S. Patent No. 5,089,893) has been obviated by appropriate amendment and should be withdrawn.

Claims 5, 9, 10 and 20 depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1 or 16, which are believed to be allowable. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over the cited references and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Accordingly, the present application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action by the Examiner is respectfully solicited.


The Examiner is respectfully invited to call the Applicants' representative at 586-498-0670 should it be deemed

beneficial to further advance prosecution of the application.

If any additional fees are due, please charge Deposit
Account No. 12-2252.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C.


Robert M. Miller
Registration No. 42,892

Dated: May 27, 2004

c/o Leo Peters
LSI Logic Corporation
1621 Barber Lane, M/S D-106 Legal
Milpitas, CA 95035

Docket No.: 00-323 / 1496.00121